



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which all the later MSS are derived, contained valuable material on the political situation in Thessaly at the end of the fifth century B.C., considerable attention has been devoted to its study and interpretation. The historians Beloch, Meyer, Pöhlmann, and others—Costanzi and Nestle for example—have been claiming that it is an original pamphlet issued in the form of a speech at the time with which it deals, while the well-known student of *Der Attizismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*, W. Schmid, has dissented, and tried to show that it really belongs to the brilliant trifter with whom it is traditionally connected.

Schmid affirmed that the style of the speech does not reveal the time of its composition; that it may equally well be an old or an archaizing production. This Drerup cannot concede. By a careful study of its style and composition—a complete *index verborum* is included—the Munich philologue, who has made a name for himself by his work on Isocrates, shows that it is really old; that it has all the expected characteristics of the rhetoric of the outgoing fifth century B.C.—the compact, antithetical, abrupt, helpless style of the pseudo-Xenophontine tract on the *Constitution of the Athenians*, shot through and through with bright colored threads from Gorgias and Thrasymachus; that it has nothing whatever in common with the neo-Attic rhetoric. This, in our judgment a decisive demonstration, is the solid contribution of Drerup's book. In the rest of his work he tries to prove that the author belonged to the circle of Theramenes, and that he sought to make propaganda for the latter's political programme by arguing for its adoption by the city of Larisa. This is simply a far-fetched attempt to explain its spurious title. For the historical and literary interpretation of the pamphlet, and for one of the most brilliant pieces of exegesis of which the reviewer knows, the reader is referred to the second part of Ed. Meyer's *Theopomps Hellenica*. Clearly, the speech belongs to 400-399 B.C., not to 404 B.C.; it deals seriously with Larisa, not obscurely with Athens, and its author was a contemporary who knew what he was talking about.

W. S. FERGUSON

Flaws in Classical Research. By J. P. POSTGATE. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. III.) London: Henry Frowde, 1909 Pp. 51. 3s 6d net.

Professor Postgate has written a most entertaining paper "drenched in matter," and full of suggestions from which even dissenters will learn. He probably knows as well as the reviewer that so large and vague a theme can have no unity other than that impressed upon it by the personality of the writer. Classical studies have for many centuries engaged some of the best intellects of Europe. To speak of "flaws in classical research" is like speaking of wrong methods in science, or attempting to

classify fallacies. It is merely a general indictment of human frailty. Still, it is interesting to learn what particular fallacies are the pet aversion of an alert and curious mind.

The differences between classical and scientific investigation, Professor Postgate tells us, are two. In classical studies there is more of the personal equation, and yet the classical student makes less allowance for it. This we think hardly goes to the root of the matter. The fundamental difference is that conflicting scientific hypotheses generally admit of adjudication by crucial experiment, while such questions as the genuineness of the Platonic letters, or the origin of the Homeric poems, obviously do not. Up to the stage of final verification, scientific doctrines are as much affected by personal or patriotic bias as are the hypotheses of philology, and up to this point the leaders of science disagree about the ether, for example, or heredity, or the ultimate constitution of matter no less than do the editors of "the Oxford and the Corpus texts of Propertius."

What Professor Postgate calls the "idols of textual critics" are simply lapses of attention, or deviations from his own preferred *via media*. Some systematically emend too much, and some as habitually defend desperate readings of a vulgate. But all intend with Professor Postgate to "act on each occasion as the balance of the evidence . . . shall determine." The dissensions of archaeologists, comparative mythologists, and textual or literary critics, which he deplores, are no more surprising than those of geologists, astronomers, and biologists about the age of the world. Specialists inevitably view all things in the light of their specialty; but in the end if there is evidence enough *securus iudicat orbis*.

The long list of interesting "errors" loosely classified as due to modern proclivities must be judged each on its merits. Some details of ancient life and some linguistic niceties will always escape us. But Professor Postgate underrates the resources of scholarship, unless, as his examples would sometimes imply, his "our" and "we" refer to undergraduates. Whatever the anonymous scholars whom he cites may do in their careless hours, "we" are not really unaware that we cannot reason about classic idiom and syntax in English translation, or that the Latin roots in English have deviated from their original meanings, or that some of these earlier meanings show more clearly in eighteenth century or Elizabethan English than in the idiom of today. And though we may not resort to explanation by hyperbaton so freely as Professor Postgate does, we find nothing startling in the statement that "order in modern sentences is syntactically essential and in ancient sentences syntactically indifferent." We are not baffled by Pindar's "Spartan bevy of girls," or his "dun herd of cattle," and as for Cerberus' "three-tongued mouth" (Hor. *Car.* ii. 19. 31), I find in my notes *ad loc.* the comment

"Triple-headed and triple-tongued is all one reckoning 'save the phrase is a little variations,'" with the substance of which Professor Postgate will probably concur, though he may deplore the "Americanism" of the phrasing.

The next point of difference noted between classical and modern languages is, I think a false one. Speaking of such phrases as Cicero's *fontium gelidae perennitates* and Phaedrus' *corvi deceptus stupor*, he says "The greater ease of what might be called the intertransience of two ideas in the circular group (that is, in inflected languages) . . . strikes us as particularly strange in a language with such a love for the concrete." But surely this usage is a matter of rhetoric, rather than of the idiom or genius of the language. It appears with euphuism and *stilo culto* in any language, ancient or modern. Not to speak of Swinburne's "purblind scrutiny of prepossession and squint-eyed inspection of malignity," it can be found in English without looking further than Byron's "blue rushing of the arrowy Rhone." It is a marked characteristic of modern French prose. Mr. Howells constantly employs it, in such phrases as "the girl's belted slenderness." It can be found on nearly every page of Mrs. Wharton, and is imitated by all young writers who are ambitious to have a style. Like everything else, it is Greek in origin, appearing in the Attic drama, if not earlier, and in Plato's later style. (Cf. Eurip. fr. 205: ἐπὼν δὲ κάλλεισιν and fr. 324: κόμης ξανθίσματα, and Plato *Laws* 625: κυπαρίττων τε ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοιςιν ὕμῃ).

The interest of the paper lies in the details, and a general summary does it injustice. Professor Postgate goes on to discuss at random *trames*, and *Pomerium*, and the Homeric article, and Terence, and Agar's emendations of the *Odyssey*, and Abbott's theory of the Latin accent, and the reading of Sapphics, and puns in Plautus. A further flaw of classical research is that we not only reject the testimony of the ancients, but read it carelessly. "Quintilian says that the final syllables of a preceding word should not be the same as the initial ones of the following," yet modern scholars, Professor Postgate complains, will illustrate this rule by Vergil's *Dorica castra*. But he forgets that all Latin rhetoric comes from the Greek rhetoricians, and that they attribute to Isocrates the rule, μηδὲ τελευτᾶν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς συλλαβῆς, οἷον εἰπούσα σαφή, etc.

To conclude, much as I have enjoyed this paper, I mark these reserves to guard against the impression which it will make upon the student or the hostile layman. In his impatience of human frailty, Professor Postgate makes too many concessions to opponents of the classics. He seems to agree with the scientific friend who remarked to him "on the classical man's inattention to details." He says severely "studies in which are so many pitfalls as ours must allow no openings to error." And again, p. 14, "there is small excuse for this blundering." But in his less cen-

sorious moods he must be aware that, though habitual blundering may be unpardonable, there is no single lapse that a great scholar may not excusably be guilty of, whether his name be Wilamowitz, Gildersleeve, Jebb, Butcher—or Postgate. I am tempted to cite examples from my *marginalia*. But we can all do it, and I forbear.

“Scimus et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.”

PAUL SHOREY

Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens. Von FRANZ POLAND. Priesschriften gekrönt und hrsg. von der fürstlich Jablonskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. Nr. XXIII der historisch-nationalökonomischen Sektion. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909. Pp. 655. M. 24.

This imposing work, which may be regarded as an enlargement and completion of Ziebarth's *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, has nine main divisions: (1) “Namen und Arten,” pp. 5–172; (2) “Götterverehrung,” pp. 173–270; (3) “Personenstand,” pp. 271–329; (4) “Organisation,” pp. 330–452; (5) “Finanzen,” pp. 453–98; (6) “Sittlichkeit,” pp. 499–513; (7) “Geschichtlichen Ueberblick,” pp. 514–34; (8) “Listen der benutzten Inschriften und Papyri,” pp. 548–630; (9) “Register,” pp. 630–55. The remainder is made up of a few pages of introduction, and thirteen pages of additions and corrections which were made necessary by the fact that the printing began in 1905.

The author was ill advised in calling his book a history. It has indeed made a history of the Greek private associations possible, but it is itself simply a collection of the materials for such a work. We hasten to add, however, that it is a complete collection; that the materials are well mastered and admirably analyzed, and that so many new, important observations are made that the whole represents a substantial scientific advance.

The term *thiasos* in Attic use meant technically, Poland remarks, a subdivision of a phratry. Hence it could not be the *abstractum* of *orgeones* or of *thiasotai*. Hence too, we may add, lists of members of *thiasoi* were normally published without the *demotica*, which arose from the relatively late, concurrent registration of citizens in the demes. Elsewhere, however, in our judgment, the lack of *demotica* signifies the presence of foreigners; so that the distinction drawn by Poland between *orgeones* and *thiasotai* is not complete. The former were all Athenians, the latter all foreigners—at least till, in the second century B. C., Athens abandoned her inveterate social exclusiveness. The associations designated by titles compounded of the names of deities and the suffix—*stai*, and especially the *eranistai*, were composed according to circumstances